

MINUTES
CITY OF RIVERSIDE
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
1,878th Meeting



6:00 p.m. March 17, 2005
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
3900 MAIN STREET

MINUTES APPROVED AS SUBMITTED
AT THE MAY 19, 2005 MEETING

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Agnew, Brown, Comer, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Norton, Singletary, Stephens

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Gutierrez, Planning Director
Aaron, Principal Planner
Jenkins, Senior Planner
Milosevic, Associate Planner
Brenes, Associate Planner
Smith, Deputy City Attorney
Andrade, Stenographer

THE FOLLOWING BUSINESS WAS CONDUCTED:

Chair Leonard reconvened the Planning Commission meeting. He informed the public that staff would be presenting an overview of what the General Plan includes. The presentation will extend through the majority of the meeting. A half hour will be allotted for public comment at the conclusion of the presentation. This is a chance for everyone to listen and learn about what is proposed, to guide the City of Riverside over the next 20 years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

K. **PUBLIC HEARING - 6:00 pm** 3

20. **PLANNING CASE P04-0178:** Planning Commission review of the General Plan 2025 Program and related Final Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH NO. 2004021108). The General Plan 2025 Program consists of the following components: 1) the City of Riverside General Plan 2025; 2) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code) and the rezoning of properties to reflect new zone names; 3) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Subdivision Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code); 4) the Citywide Design Guidelines; and 5) the Implementation Plan. 3

L. **ADJOURNMENT** 12

K. PUBLIC HEARING - 6:00 pm

20. **PLANNING CASE P04-0178:** Planning Commission review of the General Plan 2025 Program and related Final Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH NO. 2004021108). The General Plan 2025 Program consists of the following components: 1) the City of Riverside General Plan 2025; 2) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code) and the rezoning of properties to reflect new zone names; 3) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Subdivision Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code); 4) the Citywide Design Guidelines; and 5) the Implementation Plan.

Ken Gutierrez, Planning Director, thanked everyone for coming tonight and explained that an overview of the General Plan would be presented tonight. He introduced Laura Stetson, with Cotton Bridges Associates.

Ms. Stetson stated she worked with a planning and consultant firm based in Pasadena. She has worked with this community over the last two years. She added that she brings a different perspective in working with staff in that she is a product of Riverside's school system, she grew up here and graduated from Poly High. This is an exciting time to be able to present the General Plan to the Planning Commission. She stated it was important for the public as a whole to understand what is in the document.

Ms. Stetson gave an overview of the General Plan and described its various components. She explained the various reasons for the update of the General Plan.

There was a question from the audience regarding the opportunity for public testimony.

Chair Leonard reiterated that the majority of this hearing would be allotted to the presentation of the Plan. There will be half an hour allocated for public testimony at the end. Several people in the audience left the meeting. He asked staff what the time table for the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan was in the context of these hearings that have been scheduled.

Craig Aaron, Principal Planner, stated that there has already been one public meeting. There will be a second public forum announced in the newspaper and a notice mailed to everyone who has shown an interest in this. There is no date set for this issue but he estimated that it would be within 2-3 months.

Commissioner Brown suggested that the information also be posted on channel 32, cable television.

Mr. Aaron stated that staff would look into this.

Ms. Stetson continued with the presentation, when she concluded she asked if there were any questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Densmore referred to the comments about the Visioning Meetings and the attendance at those meetings, which for a town this large wasn't all that great. He was concerned mainly with the attendance at the local community meetings.

Diane Jenkins, Senior Planner, explained that staff attended the Mayor's Night Out meetings and distributed information and explained the process. Staff was also present at Wednesday Night On the Mall doing the same thing as often as possible.

Commissioner Densmore asked if whether the information that was given out was about the General Plan or information about specific zoning changes.

Ms. Jenkins said that the information provided was about the General Plan program. Also, she noted that the first Neighborhood Conference was about advertising the first Citizens Congress where citizens would have the opportunity to provide their input.

Commissioner Densmore inquired if the impacts of the changes to the Zoning Ordinance was pro-actively explained to the people who would suffer the consequences of those changes.

Ms. Stetson explained that because of the detailed nature of Zoning and the fact that it was citywide and affected many properties, it was very difficult to address specifics in any type of community presentation. The opportunities folks had to learn about the changes to the Zoning Ordinance were part of the study sessions that were held with the Planning Commission. She noted that the City is not obligated under the law but that staff did send out individual notices to those people whose properties would be affected and encouraged people to speak with staff.

Craig Aaron, Principal Planner, added that for a City this size, he would take exception to the statement that the first Congress wasn't well attended. Staff sent out over 6,000 notices and answered thousands of phone calls. As Ms. Stetson stated earlier, the City is not obligated by law to send out those notices. It was staff's decision to make sure that everyone affected specifically was notified. It was a monumental effort on staff's part and a very difficult issue to explain in a written notice. Staff made the best effort that could have been expected.

Commissioner Densmore said he wouldn't comment further on whether or not the attendance of 600, in a City of 150,000+, was well attended. He did not intend his comments to be a criticism. He asked whether the update of the General Plan was a legal requirement. He also asked if the consultant, prior to putting the draft General Plan together, talked to the neighborhoods or businesses that would specifically be affected by the changes in the Zoning Code.

Ms. Stetson responded that it is a legal requirement that the City have an up to date General Plan that meets State Law. State Law does say that the Housing Element has to be updated. There is nothing in the State Law that says a General Plan has to be updated every 10, 15 or 20 years, it simply states that it meet current State Law and really reflect the City's vision for itself. She explained that there was not direct contact made with specific neighborhoods about the proposed changes.

Mr. Aaron informed the Commission that staff met with every division of the Greater Chambers of Commerce as well as several meetings with the Zoning Task Force. Staff is currently meeting with the General Plan Task Force of the Chambers of Commerce. He noted that there was an effort to reach out to the business community.

Commissioner Stephens stated he has participated in quite a few General Plan updates and can say that the City of Riverside has done a phenomenal job compared to other cities he has worked with. He asked if the Elements of the General Plan would be discussed to night in greater detail.

Chair Leonard stated that the discussion on the General Plan Elements would begin tonight, he didn't know how far they would get through the Elements. He asked staff to respond to an earlier question with regard to the relationship or effect the Plan would have on Rancho La Sierra.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that the General Plan will have absolutely no effect on the Rancho La Sierra project. The Council approved a Specific Plan Overlay Zone and a Development Agreement. This is in the Courts right now

to seek an opinion as to whether that is an appropriate action. If it is approved, there will be a Specific Plan developed for Rancho La Sierra. The Specific Plan is a detailed study focusing on the Rancho La Sierra property which includes the part along the river as well as the La Sierra Hills. The context of the earlier question had to do with the open space and the ring of open space in the river. The river itself is not part of the Rancho La Sierra project, as a matter of fact, the previous plan required a 400' buffer from the river. The open space in the river itself, the trail system is part of the river and is still going to connect with or without that project. The open space will continue, there will be no impact.

Ms. Stetson reviewed the Land Use Element. She reviewed the 29 sites which were identified by the Citizen's Advisory Committee and explained the rationale for the change. The bearing this has is that there will be related zone changes on these properties to ensure the implementation of the General Plan.

Commissioner Comer as we have seen with the other industrial zoning changes, the existing zoning will be changed to the new proposed zoning through many of these mixed use designations.

Ms. Stetson corrected Commissioner Comer in that it is the General Plan Land Use designations that will change. The City will need to eventually change the Zoning to be consistent with that General Plan designation in order to implement the vision.

Commissioner Comer noted that the Commission has been yelled at over the last couple of weeks because of changes to the existing Zoning to the General Plan. With regard to these sites that have been presented tonight, he asked if the Zoning would be changed to be consistent with the General Plan.

Ms. Stetson responded no.

Commissioner Comer asked why.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that the proposal for these 29 sites is to build in some flexibility through mixed use development. Staff's proposal is not to change the Zoning at this time but to create the tools and framework so that Zoning can be changed at some point in the future. He used as an example the 5-points site at which staff is proposing the Mixed Use Village designation. Staff sees this as an opportunity to rejuvenate the retail area by bringing more residential.

Commissioner Comer stated that he did not disagree with having a vision for the future. He asked what was different from what the Commission has been presented the past couple of weeks where the Zoning is being changed. The General Plan designation is being changed on other properties, however, some are chosen to be rezoned now and some aren't.

Mr. Gutierrez replied that the properties had to be rezoned because the current R-2 and M-2 Zones were proposed for elimination. The difference is that the current zoning was proposed for elimination but with these sites, the Zoning is not being touched.

Commissioner Densmore asked what the criteria was to determine a site is under utilized. He also asked if the decision had been made that the Magnolia Center was under utilized.

Ms. Stetson responded that the Magnolia Center was not identified as a focus area in the General Plan. She stated that a site was determined under utilized based on long term observation of how the center works or functioned in a community. Planning entails taking a big picture approach but you have to start looking at particular areas of the City that haven't done much or seem to be suffering economically and ask the question

what are some of the reasons the area might be suffering. She felt that basically the criteria was based on a good empirical observation by trained planning professionals.

Commissioner Densmore commented on whether it could be possible to assist the businesses rather than changing the vision in the area. He also asked if it would be difficult for a business to obtain a loan based on the General Plan designation change. The Commission has heard this many times, specifically with the Zoning Code. The Zoning sometimes changes because there is supposed to be a consistency between the Zoning Code and the General Plan and his guess would be that the first part of that change comes with the adoption of the General Plan.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that he could not answer for the financial institutions. He stated that Zoning is what dictates Land Use, not the General Plan. The General Plan is a vision of how it could happen over a long period of time. As a general rule, lenders look at the Zoning of the property.

Ms. Stetson expanded on Commissioner Densmore's comment regarding other approaches to assist the centers to rejuvenate themselves. As these 29 areas are reviewed, the proposals before the Commission are recommendations but that there could be other options for these properties. These are the recommendations that have arisen as a result of meetings with the public and the Citizen's Advisory Committee review. If there are other options the Commission would like to explore, that is the purpose of going through these and looking at each site. She agreed that there could be other options.

Commissioner Comer said that the Commission is consistently told that they are not to take into consideration financial impacts. He felt there was a conflict between what they have been told and what they are being told today. Today the Commission heard a case where a vacant property was currently zoned C-2. If someone wanted to build on it and it did not meet the current General Plan, which was mixed use, the property was now obligated to comply with the General Plan Mixed Use designation. He stated that he did not understand.

Mr. Gutierrez used the 5-points site as an example. The property is zoned C-2 and staff is suggesting the Mixed Use designation. The property could be developed with a C-2 use because that is the zoning of the property. If someone wanted to build a mixed use development combining residential, retail or office, they would have to apply to the Planning Commission for a Mixed Use Zone.

Commissioner Comer recalled the earlier case heard by the Commission which involved property zoned residential that could not build their residential subdivision until they applied for a General Plan Amendment to match the current Zoning. He was hearing conflicts as to what can and cannot be done on the property.

Mr. Gutierrez replied that the Mixed Use designation being discussed allows office, retail and residential. If the Zoning on the property allows office, retail or residential the project may proceed because it is consistent with the General Plan designation. The case heard by the Commission this morning had two completely different categories that did not relate to each other.

Commissioner Comer inquired if a person could build a C-2 / Residential property now.

Mr. Gutierrez said that today it could not be done. With a Mixed Use designation, the property could be rezoned to allow any combination of those uses. This is a tool that is available to property owner and the Planning Commission to apply and adds flexibility to their decisions.

Commissioner Stephens stated that he appreciated the Planning Director's statement in that it adds flexibility. He felt that this would be the direction more and more parties will take. The public hasn't seen this but this

Commission has been struggling with Mixed Use on a case by case basis for quite a long time. The City is making the effort to have the Mixed Use concept codified in the General Plan. He did not think the intent was to force this but to nourish and allow it to happen where it can.

Commissioner Densmore commented that if someone drove by and called out 5-points as an under utilized center, even though the furniture shop has been there for many years and might disagree. If the vision for this area is Mixed Use and the designation is changed, what protection is built in. Staff says that they are not changing the Zoning Code and yet the underlying philosophy is that at some point in time the Zoning Code should and will be made consistent with the General Plan. What protections are being built in so that an existing property owner who has been struggling in the area is not forced out.

Ms. Stetson clarified that her earlier comments regarding under utilized sites and that she did not mean to imply that all of the 29 sites were under utilized. This is not the case, some of those have been defined as under utilized but there are other reasons for selecting a site. The reason 5-points was selected as a focus area is that it has tremendous opportunity due to the new developments occurring in that area. If that furniture store, as Mr. Gutierrez indicated, would rather stay with its Commercial Zoning, which fits within the context of Mixed Use because it is an allowed use, they could do that. With regard to the kind of protections that are built in, if it is a conforming use, which Commercial is under Mixed Use, it could continue to operate.

Commissioner Densmore asked about a nonconforming use.

Ms. Stetson replied that any nonconforming use no matter how it got to be nonconforming is subject to the nonconforming regulations in the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Densmore felt that the protection was kind of slim. What he is looking for is the fact that terms like beauty and under utilization, vision for the future and cleanliness are highly subjective. If he were a leader, he would convince the property owners in a particular area that this was good for them but if he couldn't do this, he would drop it. This will be what he will be watching for.

The Commission took a break at this time.

Chair Leonard announced that to the commissioners that there has been a request that when they speak to please get close to their microphone. Ms. Stetson will be reviewing the General Plan changes for the 29 sites that have been identified. This will be the conclusion of the Land Use Element review this evening and public testimony will be taken at that time.

Commissioner Densmore said he misspoke and rephrased his question. He mentioned earlier the Magnolia Center but meant the Brockton Arcade. There has been a lot of testimony in previous meetings about the success of the Brockton Arcade. He asked if the Brockton Arcade was one of those 29 identified areas and if so why.

Ms. Stetson responded that the Brockton Arcade was not identified as an under utilized area. She began an overview of the 29 sites.

Mr. Gutierrez noted that area 19 which includes a the little square at Brockton and Nelson indicating a change from Commercial to Office is a mapping error. The site is currently a Commercial site and it is not staff's intent to change this.

Commissioner Comer inquired if these 29 sites will be rezoned to the new Land Use Designation for Zoning consistency.

Ms. Jenkins replied that notices were sent out regarding the General Plan designation change but that the Zoning would not be changed unless the properties are currently zoned M-1 or M-2 which is being proposed for deletion under the new Zoning Code.

Ms. Stetson said that the final sites were termed clean-up changes to the General Plan map. After the Citizen's Advisory Committee review and during the process of putting together the final map, staff noticed 6-7 sites that needed to change to reflect either the uses on the ground today or just general clean up because the map had been wrong. She reviewed these final sites with the Commission.

Commissioner Stephens announced that the City of Riverside has just formally accepted the Riverside County ALUC plan for the area and was a phenomenal accomplishment. Based on the presentation, there are several areas that are affected by airports that either consider this because that is one of the requirements of the City to amend their General Plan. He expressed his concerns regarding the March JPA which will soon be going through their own Land Use Plan. One of the two of the examples, it looks like they anticipate the Inland Cargo Ports Development because there is a potential for that to be a regional airport and the over flights may be drastically different. He asked if staff had anticipated this and was built into these areas because one or two of them address that.

Mr. Gutierrez replied that staff has taken that into account, The JLUS (Joint Land Use Study) has not been completed as of yet. Staff proposes to put that in an Overlay Zone.

Chair Leonard thanked Ms. Stetson for her presentation. There is an underlying theme that seems to be here and that while not in every case, for the large part these opportunity areas are along the designated corridors of the City. The message he is getting is that no change is being sought within the established neighborhoods and business districts so that there won't be expansion of the urban base into outlying areas particularly the greenbelt. He asked if this was an objective purposefully being sought through these changes.

Ms. Stetson replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Densmore referred to area I which appears to be Mixed Use and is contrary to Ms. Stetson's reply to Chair Leonard's question.

Ms. Stetson explained that this was an area that was called out very late in the process as an area that may be part of an expanded Redevelopment Project Area. It has not been noticed to the public in any manner, it is new information brought forward and will be one the Commission may have a lot of questions about.

Chair Leonard opened the hearing for public testimony.

Roy Nearman, 28798 Oakridge Rd., Highland, spoke regarding the Adams Plaza. He is also a representative of Hyrosen Properties which has eight different properties being rezoned by the proposed plan. They have no objections except for the Adams Plaza site. Adams Plaza has always had a designation as a Community Shopping Center C-1-A. The site is across from the Auto Center. He compared the site to the Town Center which is retaining the CRC - Commercial Regional Center. The Town Center is not off any major Freeway. They are ready to do an 11 million dollar rehabilitation of the center but will not invest if this change takes place because it would decrease the value by 6 million dollars right from the start.

Commissioner Comer asked why Mr. Nearman stated that the value of the property would be diminished and if it was because of the intensities of the uses present at this time.

Mr. Nearman said yes. The tenants they have are allowed uses but if the Shell Station moved out they would be unable to put in a new gas station in three months and would lose that use. He noted that the same would apply for to the Bakers. He reiterated that the primary and best use for that property, sitting right next to the freeway, is a Regional Shopping Center.

Commissioner Norton asked for clarification in that she understood that Mixed Use provided more options and did not take away the existing uses.

Mr. Gutierrez compared the site to a Commercial Regional Center which has a floor ration area (FAR) of .5 while Mixed Use Village has a FAR for the Commercial component of 2.5. Mixed Use Village is a much higher density, higher intensity kind of use. He reminded the Commission that this was a General Plan designation change.

Commissioner Comer asked about the uses allowed currently.

Mr. Gutierrez pointed out that these uses are Conditional Use Permitted uses and would not change.

Mr. Nearman indicated that the whole section including the station is proposed to be changed under the proposed Zone change.

Chair Leonard stated that there are no zone changes pursued on that site. There is a Mixed Use General Plan designation that would change and staff has just clarified that it would allow the current uses to continue.

Mr. Aaron added that the uses would not become nonconforming. The uses are allowed because the Zone is remaining the same until someone wants to develop it as Mixed Use and the owner asks for a rezoning of the property. The City does not intend to rezone that property.

Chair Leonard asked staff to keep reminding the Commission of this because it can get confusing.

Commissioner Densmore stated consistency is requested or expected between the General Plan and Zoning Code. At some point in time could the matter come up where the Zoning is changed and this gentleman's concerns are realized.

Mr. Aaron stated that the City Council and Planning Commission can initiate a Zone change at any time. There are no plans to rezone that property. Staff's intent is that when the owner, current or new, intends to develop the property as Mixed Use Village, they would apply for the Mixed Use Village Zone. The City does not have any intent to rezone it, it is simply a General Plan change. He replied that yes the property can be rezoned.

Commissioner Brown felt the question was more basic, could there have been a mistake in developing the General Plan. Is it an oversight not to consider this site a Regional Center.

Chair Leonard said that there isn't conflict, it is not the intent to remove any of the rights assigned to this property today.

Mr. Nearman it is always easier to come to the Commission and say they would like to have a more general use than to give up their special Commercial use and go to Mixed Use.

William Dieterly stated he had three office buildings at 3772, 3752 and 3763 Arlington Avenue that he was concerned about. He received notice that the Zoning would change to Mixed Use Village. The main reason he was angry about this was that he was intimidated thinking that the value of his property would be reduced by something that happens here. If this rezoning will not change anything, why do it. He has a wide spectrum of tenants at these locations and he did not want to reduce his ability to lease the property. He stated that he has submitted a request for the Commission's consideration to retain his current Zoning and Land Use designation. He asked that the Commission support this request.

Commissioner Stephens commented that these testimonies are the heart of what the Commission will hear the rest of the evening, confusion between General Plan and what that means for the future and Zoning designation. As Mr. Aaron indicated, Council has the authority to do that regardless of the process going through tonight. He asked that at a future meeting the Commission have a presentation just on the differences between those. He could see why people would be very concerned if they felt this was a Zone change instead of General Plan designation change.

Chair Leonard informed Commissioner Stephens that staff is working on a matrix of existing uses allowed under the existing Zoning Code and those under the proposed Zone.

Commissioner Stephens said that he could not think of a single slide that didn't actually provide the property owner with more flexibility. There was a couple near the airport that may be restricted but those exceptions aside, every slide presented was an improvement in flexibility.

RA Barnett, Highgrove area, observed that this is supposed to be a public hearing yet they have sat for 2 ½ hours listening to the testimony between the members of the Commission. He thought that at the public hearing it was the opportunity for the public to have their say. During the break he spoke with the Planning Director and it is his understanding that the members of the Citizens Advisory Committee were from within the City limits of Riverside. The people in Highgrove are outside the City limits yet they received notices that their Land Use would be changing. His observation is that the problem is in a group making this determination outside their boundaries. If someone from Highgrove were on these committees, it would probably carry a little bit more weight. He asked for a copy of area 25, D-1 and D-2.

Chair Leonard asked staff to respond to Mr. Barnett's question regarding why the City deals with properties not within the City's limits.

Ms. Stetson explained that there are areas called Spheres of Influence. These are areas that are nearby that could one day be incorporated into the City of Riverside. State Law gives the City the ability to plan for those areas within its Sphere of Influence. What the City is doing by planning in the Sphere of Influence is showing that if this were a part of Riverside this is what we would like for this area.

Lynn Miller, 2675 Third Street, addressed focus area 28. Earlier it was stated that it appeared staff was trying to consolidate property and bring it together. He owns 2 ½ acres off of Commerce in area 28 that is currently zoned M-2 and is proposed for BMP. He pointed out that he had an active railroad on both sides of his property and that setback requirements alone would preclude him from constructing an office on this property. He stated that his tenants utilize the M-2 Zoning and he did not see how an Office Park would work.

Kimberly Sparkman, 5958 Jasmine, said she was excited to see the citywide policy was to preserve industrial land. What she sees is that the City was getting rid of industrial land and turning it into office. She asked her bank regarding loans on a nonconforming property and was told they would not loan money on a nonconforming

property. She wanted to know why everything was being renamed. People buy M-1 property because it is a valuable piece of property. Why are things being renamed and why is M-1 being deleted.

Chair Leonard indicated that staff would provide an answer at conclusion of public testimony

Yolanda Garland, resident of La Sierra, spoke in opposition of the public hearing process. She felt that nothing the public has said has made any difference. She did not hear a designation for La Sierra and asked why. She asked who at City Hall has the right to tell a property owner that their property is under utilized. She encouraged the audience to log onto talkriverside.com.

Ernest Pintor, 4260 Isabella Street, said he was professional land surveyor. He wanted to speak about the Mixed Use Village specifically at Muir St. between Magnolia and Primrose. He represents Lou Sheridan and the Estate of Ms. Toadin. They received a notice concerning two parcels at the southwesterly side of Muir Street. At first glance they felt that Mixed Use Village was great for specific areas, such as beach cities, or foreign countries. These properties extend 700' away from the major thoroughfare and in order for that Zone to work there should be 24 hour foot traffic. He stated that the property owners were against the proposed Zoning. He pointed out that these lots were part of an older Subdivision and are only 50' wide.

Mary Carranza, 88 Highland in Highgrove, stated that her property is designated for office buildings. She found it hard that someone would consider turning this residential area and turn into office buildings. The street behind her is commercial and has four businesses on it.

Dennis Kid, 2287 Pico Street, Grand Terrace, stated that he owned property in Highgrove on Center Street. He would prefer to have the County's General Plan designation for the area, Commercial. The County staff came out to Highgrove and had many meetings discussing the General Plan. The City is imposing this designation without consulting the Highgrove residents. He stated he opposed the proposal and suggested that the City work with the County. He also asked City staff to attend one of the Highgrove meetings to explain these changes.

Kristy Forsythe, 19334 Krameria, said that the reason she came here was that she was told Krameria was slated as a four lane boulevard. She was very concerned about this.

Chair Leonard asked Ms. Forsythe to return on March 31, or speak with staff. This issue is part of the Circulation and Mobility Element and they would not get that far tonight. They will start on this Element at the March 31st meeting and the Commission will also have the information before them at that time.

Mary Humbolt, 7407 Dufferin Avenue, commented that the residents have voted time and again the for lesser density. She spoke specifically to the 91 Freeway and Madison at the Bally's Center. She spoke against the Mixed Use Urban designation. She asked that this be deleted from the General Plan, it is not what the residents of Riverside want.

Hubie Byrne, Sugarbush Properties, spoke with regard to the Town Square Center. The proposal is to designate the property Mixed Use Village but they would prefer Mixed Use Urban because it would allow more opportunity for business. He informed the Commission that they received a notification on March 15 from RUSD that they are considering purchasing property for an elementary school development adjacent to their property. The Mixed Use Urban states that one difference between Mixed Use Village and Urban is that the Mixed Use Urban is student oriented activities. In that regard they would like to start a formal dialogue to change the designation.

Chair Leonard thanked everyone for attending. He explained that they have gone through a few Elements tonight and that this would probably be the longest presentation the audience would sit through. It is a level of detail the Commission needed in order to review the Zoning designations next month. This particular subject will continue March 31, and will start with the Circulation and Mobility Element.

Commissioner Kurani reminded the Commission that there was a question still pending regarding the M-1 Zone.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that for the most part a lot of the names of the Zones do not relate to the Zones. The numbers, for example R-1-65 used to tie to a 6,500 sqft lot size. The lot size was changed many years ago to 7000 sqft. The same is true with the Commercial Zones, staff is trying to change the name of the Zone to be reflective of the uses in those Zones. The intent is to make it easier for those not using the Zone Code everyday so that they have some understanding of what the name means.

Ms. Jenkins announced that the Powerpoint presentation reviewed tonight is on the City's web site and available for further review. The Powerpoint presentation will include the topics for the next meeting.

L. ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment to March 31, 2005 at 6:00 pm in the Art Pick Council Chambers.